DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 849 CS 207 171

AUTHOR Webster, William E.; Page, Ernest R.
TITLE The Teaching of Writing as Quality Staff Development. Monograph Number One.
INSTITUTION California State Coll., Bakersfield.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 36p.; Prepared through the Kern/Eastern Sierra Writing Project.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Staff Development; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Improvement; *Teaching Models; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Kern Eastern Sierra Writing Project; Writing Projects

ABSTRACT

Twelve lessons were learned from the Kern/Eastern Sierra Writing Project (KESWP): (1) successful teachers of writing can be identified and their practices demonstrated to others; (2) writing is an important way to learn as well as to communicate--the process of writing is as valuable as the product; (3) teachers of writing must write; (4) most writing teachers are inadequately prepared and lack opportunities to become aware of current research in writing; (5) the responsibility of teaching writing, shared by all levels of the educational community, can best be addressed by cooperatively planned and funded efforts; (6) the best teacher of teachers is another successful teacher; (7) the skills besides good writing needed by a teacher/consultant can be taught and learned; (8) effective teachers of teachers must know themselves as well as the system with which they are working; (9) for a writing improvement program to be effective, all parties concerned must agree on the nature of the training and the expected results; (10) specific working strategies can help teacher/consultants become more effective; (11) there is a set of known criteria for quality programs of staff development; and (12) individuals with consultant skills and knowledge of staff development programs can make major contributions to the improvement of writing in school systems in which they work. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220849

KERN/EASTERN SIERRA WRITING PROJECT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE TEACHING OF WRITING AS QUALITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT

William E. Webster

and

Ernest R. Page

Monograph Number One

Printed 1982 at
Cal State Bakersfield
Bakersfield, California 93309

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William E. Webster
Ernest R. Page

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS207171

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii
Deborah Osen Hancock, Dean, School of Education, CSB

PREFACE iv
Beverly Banks and Robert Laramee, Co-Directors, KESWP

The Teaching of Writing 1

I. Successful teachers of writing can be identified and their practices effectively demonstrated to others. 1

II. Writing is an important way to learn as well as a method of communication. The process of writing is as valuable as the product. . . . 2

III. Teachers of writing must write. 5

IV. Most teachers have not been adequately prepared as teachers of writing nor do they have the opportunities to become aware of current research in writing. 6

V. The responsibility for teaching writing, shared by all levels of the educational community, can best be addressed by cooperatively planned and cooperatively funded efforts. 8

VI. The best teacher of teachers is another successful teacher. 9

Quality Staff Development 10

I. In addition to good writing, there is an equally important set of skills necessary for a teacher/consultant to be effective in working in school systems to improve writing programs. These skills, too, can be taught and learned. . 11

II. To be effective as teachers of teachers, teacher/consultants must know themselves as well as the system with which they are working. 13

III. For a writing improvement program to be effective, all significant parties concerned must mutually agree on the nature of the training program to be conducted and the expected results. 15

IV. Specific working strategies can help teacher/consultants become more effective . . 18

V. There is a set of known criteria for quality programs of staff development. . . . 24

VI. Individuals who have a mastery of consultant skills and knowledge of characteristics of programs of staff development can make major contributions to the improvement of writing in school systems in which they work. 30

FOREWORD

This monograph marks the beginning of a new publishing effort in the CSB School of Education. Writing for teachers of writing is an appropriate place to begin this new effort.

This publication, written by two members of CSB's School of Education faculty, offers teachers of writing new perspectives worthy of their consideration and should be of special interest to teacher-consultants in CSB's Kern/Eastern Sierra Writing Project. Its focus on quality staff development promises assistance to the teacher-consultant in the unique consultant role which they play.

Monograph authors Page and Webster bring considerable experience in working with teachers and staff development, and readers of this monograph should find this publication an effective aid to bridging research and practice in the teaching of composition.

Deborah Osen Hancock, Dean
School of Education
Cal State Bakersfield

PREFACE

It is appropriate that this publication, the first of the Kern/Eastern Sierra Writing Project, has as its topic the writing project model as quality in-service. Improvement in the teaching of writing is the very heart of the writing project. This publication will assist readers in understanding the basic assumptions that underlie all writing project sites. Additionally this booklet will assist teacher/consultants in developing the attitudes and skills required to be effective teachers of teachers.

Both Bill and Ernie are teachers and both have wide ranges of experience in staff development. They work successfully with teachers at all levels, sharing their experience and serving as models for the ideas and attitudes represented here.

Beverly Banks
Robert Laramee
Co-Directors, KESWP

The Teaching of Writing as Quality Staff Development

by

William E. Webster

and

Ernest R. Page

THE TEACHING OF WRITING

The success of the Kern/Eastern Sierra Writing Project (KESWP), to a large degree, belongs to its parent model, the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP). From its Berkeley beginnings in 1974, the BAWP concept has been duplicated at eighty plus sites in the National Writing Project (NWP), including seventeen projects in the California Writing Project (CWP). If any one variable gives testimony to the effectiveness and acclaim of these endeavors, it is that each satellite functions under common and related assumptions. Simply stated, KESWP and its sister projects across the continent, Alaska, Hawaii, and abroad all believe in and practice precepts founded in educational research and plain common sense. As generated by KESWP, these pivotal and crucial common denominators follow.

I. <u>Successful teachers of writing can be identified and their practices effectively demonstrated to others.</u>

Successful teachers of writing at any level of instruction stand apart from those who are not as successful. In KESWP, exemplary writing teachers are identified as such, are invited or nominated to attend a Summer Writing

Institute, and are given $500 stipends to participate with other successful kindergarten through college writing teachers in the Institute. Each selected teacher plans and presents to peers a classroom-proven approach or technique in the teaching of writing. The sharing of ideas is the basis of the project's success. If procedures and practices work for one writing teacher, they then become more available to other writing teachers.

II. Writing is an important way to learn as well as a method of communication. The process of writing is as valuable as the product.

The first point in the above assumption is graphically illustrated as we write. Spread out before us, in a variety of disarray, are five articles, four books, three newsletters, two brochures (we are tempted to write, "and a partridge in a pear tree"), and one dictionary. Why else would we utilize the above resources if not to continue to learn so that we may communicate in writing?

Equal in importance to the concepts of learning to learn and learning to communicate, the process of writing also invites and promotes learning about self. No other endeavor, save learning to teach, perhaps, demands self-analysis and self-understanding as closely and as rigorously as does writing. When faced with the blank page, the writer addresses not only the problem of "creating text," as Charles Cooper would say, but is challenged, too, by the

problems that are centered in the person. Some questions that we all may ask when composing follow:

--Who am I in relation to the material about which I am writing?

--How will my ideas be received by the audience?

--How secure am I about the manner in which I am writing?

--Why do I procrastinate?

--How shall I accept criticism for what I am writing?

--What am I learning about me as I write?

In his latest book entitled A Personal Approach to Teaching: Beliefs That Make a Difference, Art Combs, author of over 130 articles and 18 books in education and psychology, asserts that the discipline of writing is both a creative experience for him as well as means to explore and order his thinking. Combs, too, believes that writing helps him discover meaning. He states that "writing forces me to explore my thinking. The process of finding ways to say things in such a manner that others can understand them clearly and precisely is at once a creative challenge for me, and a tremendous help in formulating my beliefs in more congruent and useful fashion."

Derek C. Bok, president of Harvard University, agrees. As reported on the front page of the May 26, 1982, edition of The Chronicle of Higher Education, President Bok prefers to work out in writing politically or morally sensitive issues before delivering his opinion. Bok maintains that if

problems are worked out on paper, "it's a wonderful discipline for making sure you have thought through the subject as a whole."

The second point in the above assumption is intimately related to debated differences and similarities that exist between such concepts as cognitive and affective domains, inductive and deductive reasoning, process and product, cause and effect, and a priori and a posteriori, philosophically. Today, we believe too much emphasis is placed on the product of student writing while the process of student writing is essentially ignored and neglected. The writing project model invites teachers to pay close and serious attention to the process by which writers/students write. In a good mathematics class, for example, stating the "correct answer" (the product) is less important than the manner in which the answer is derived (the process). However, this does not mean that teachers of math or writing are disinterested in quality products. Both areas of study readily verify that quality process lends itself to quality product. In a world where most people and teachers perceive and value existence in a good/bad, right/wrong, white/black, binary fashion, it is imperative that all writers, especially students, realize that a piece of writing, including this one, is always in the process of becoming.

III. Teachers of writing must write.

An analogy from an area of study known as Art Education may help in establishing and explaining this particular assumption. Question: How is it possible for an art teacher to understand and feel what students are experiencing when trying to create art when that teacher does not engage in the same process? The relationship appears obvious. Teachers of art, writing, or of anything else, for that matter, best understand and appreciate the challenge, difficulty, and frustration associated with creating a composition when they experience, even if at a different level of expertise, what students experience when engaged in the process of composing. If educational research has taught us anything, one "truth" appears to surface above all others. That is, quality time on task correlates positively with student growth. If teachers expect students to learn how to write, then they must have students engage in written composition as frequently as possible. Of equal importance, writing teachers should adhere to the same proposition, should share their writing with peers and students, and, by example, would then function as practicing, positive models for learners.

IV. Most teachers have not been adequately prepared as teachers of writing nor do they have the opportunities to become aware of current research in writing.

Although the BAWP model functions primarily at the inservice level, the idea of applying writing project principles at the preservice level is tantalizing. Given the manner in which English/Language Arts teachers have been prepared traditionally to teach written composition, writing project premises and practices may prove advantageous to neophyte teachers. As a start, the Teacher Education Department at Cal State, Bakersfield is initiating procedures which will add a two unit required course to its elementary and secondary credential programs that will focus on the teaching of writing across the curriculum. Based on tested writing project procedures, this course in the teaching of writing might aid student teachers in coping effectively with the awesome responsibility of teaching students to write, in all of its dimensions.

There exists a plethora of recent information about the teaching of writing which did not exist 15 or even 10 years ago. For example, that writing is perceived as a tripartite activity incorporating at least three different yet related skill components is a relatively recent discovery: prewriting (experiences and thinking that help generate the composition), writing (creating the composition), and postwriting (evaluating, revising, and rewriting the composition). Other evidence shows that student writing becomes

more effective when a string of shorter, less semantically dense sentences are combined to produce more intricate, complicated, and powerful sentences. Further studies seem to indicate, we believe, that the writing teacher's purpose is to help students make various decisions during the three stages of composing. This does not mean that teachers make decisions for writers, but that writing teachers provide students with oral and written options and information that permit writers to make their own decisions. Concomitantly, writers need to draw from a rich field of experiences. Teachers should function as providers of small group, large group, dramatic, media, language, speaking, listening, and hypothesis-setting situations wherein students derive a wealth of material from and about which to write. Too, the question of teaching grammar is still controversial. Research studies show that teaching the laws and rules of grammar does not improve student writing, thinking, reading, interpreting literature, studying a foreign language, or language behavior in general. Yet, teachers, parents, and administrators across the country promote the teaching of grammar as a panacea for all English/language arts ills and skills, especially writing.

V. The responsibility for teaching writing, shared by all levels of the educational community, can best be addressed by cooperatively planned and cooperatively funded efforts.

The writing project, by definition, embodies and exemplifies the various components of the above precept. Along with kindergarten through twelfth grade teachers, each site in the NWP network is challenged to make a special effort to invite and include community and four year college instructors in the Summer Institute. When writing teachers from many grades and levels come together to write and share information and techniques about the teaching of writing, then participants may prove more energetic and effective in improving student writing. Too, teachers may then become less prone to point the finger of blame at others for reasons why students are poor writers. When teachers attend the Summer Institute to interact, to make presentations, to write, and to cooperate with each other, the students in those teachers' classes ultimately benefit because their teachers were engaged in like experiences.

Funding for the 80 plus sites of the NWP is also a cooperative venture. As administered by and distributed through BAWP in Berkeley, financial support has come from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and, in California, the University of California, Berkeley through funds furnished by the State Legislature. Local school districts and host college and

university campuses supply important "in kind" support to each project. As well, many Project Directors and Co-Directors accomplish their leadership tasks as additional, second assignments beyond regular responsiblities in establishing the writing project model as an exemplary process for improving instruction in writing.

VI. The best teacher of teachers is another successful teacher.

Jim Gray, Director of NWP, CWP, and BAWP, in a recent letter to the CWP leaders, wrote the following:

> One of the most important working assumptions of the BAWP/CWP model is that each site in this project is training teachers to teach teachers. We speak proudly of the "ripple effect" inherent in the model--that the real impact of this project on teachers happens during the inservice workshops that take place during the school year. And yet, while all sites do conduct inservice programs, this important dimension appears far short of what it should be in what is now the fifth year of the project. . . . Clearly, improving and extending the inservice effort is a major priority for all projects during this funding period. This is a major recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

As Gray and the Advisory Committee suggest, the inservice, staff development component is central to the writing project model. The balance of this paper addresses this pivotal and crucial aspect. It may be understandable that writing project participants and leaders do find a modicum of difficulty generating long term, contracted inservice programs because most, if not all, of the participants were

trained as teachers. However, and this may be the problem, very few, if any, were trained as consultants. Functioning as a consultant to a neighboring or home school district encompasses a repertoire of skills which is different from those utilized as a teacher in a classroom, and for obvious reasons. The purpose of the remainder of this paper, then, is to focus specifically on the various consulting and inservice elements that may help teacher/consultants create and insure quality staff development over a long term basis.

QUALITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT

As now organized and similar to other sites of the CWP and NWP, KESWP has a permanent project staff. In the case of KESWP, the project staff also teach or administer in local school districts or at Cal State, Bakersfield. In addition to the project staff, there are the teacher/consultants who have spent one summer in the intensive writing-training part of the project and who have also attended a series of one or two day workshops during the school year following the summer effort.

It is the project staff who are contacted by schools or school districts interested in improving their writing programs. The school system contact person is usually a principal or superintendent who, through either an informal or possibly more formal needs assessment process, has determined that there is a need for a writing improvement

program in their school or district. Teachers are usually involved in this decision-making process, but not always. Experience in KESWP, as well as other program sites, has made it clear that teachers should be involved in the process from the beginning, and this aspect of the program will be developed at greater length in this paper.

After the contact has been made and the decision to move ahead with the improvement effort has been determined, the project leaders review the training needs and then select as consultants those individuals who appear to have the skills to meet the training needs as defined and agreed upon.

The philosophical underpinnings of writing improvement based on the six assumptions described in the first half of this paper are fundamental foundations of all the work of KESWP. Experience, interaction with colleagues involved in a variety of staff development activities, and analysis of emerging research in the area have led to the generation of additional assumptions which relate directly to quality inservice programs based in the teaching of writing.

I. <u>In addition to good writing, there is an equally important set of skills necessary for a teacher/consultant to be effective in working in school systems to improve writing programs. These skills, too, can be taught and learned</u>.

The additional set of skills alluded to above are housed in such areas as planning, group process, quickly

understanding a new environment, evaluation, and dealing with resistance. Knowing what good consultant skills are and being able to recognize them in or teach them to other people are crucial for the project staff. Understanding the significance of and acquiring these skills are important to teacher/consultants as they assume their new role--assisting others to improve their ability to teach students to write.

Working with a system in a helping or consultant capacity, the project staff and teacher/consultants, in particular, are in a different role, no longer simply teachers but rather outside experts. The teachers they are serving, whether they be old friends or strangers, will be somewhat skeptical and do some testing before perceiving and accepting them as competent enough to help them. Through the years most teachers have come to faculty meetings, workshops, and other training sessions, often with high expectations, only to be disappointed and often angered by incompetent trainers who could not do the job. With experience, consultants learn that teacher skepticism is related to the role and not the consultant as an individual. The burden of proof, however, rests with the consultants as the clients wait to see what will be offered and if, indeed, that which is offered will be of help to them.

II. To be effective as teachers of teachers, teacher/consultants must know themselves as well as the system with which they are working.

For consultants to feel secure enough in their role to avoid defensiveness, scapegoating, and other negative behavior that will hinder doing the job, it is important that they know their own strengths and weaknesses. Before starting the assignment, each teacher/consultant is encouraged to do a self-analysis as to behavior, temperament, ego needs, reactions, and working needs. Some important questions that each may ask follow:

--Can I handle adversity?

--Can I be criticized?

--Am I patient?

--Can I work in a problem-solving way?

--Can I deal with conflict?

--Do I listen?

Teacher/consultants should understand that their intervention in the normal life of an organization may cause some disruption in the lives of the participants. This means that they may place a strain on the total system and possibly even generate some conflict. Even when working "at home," consultants should realize that they are, in fact, functioning in new roles while still members of that system. Nonetheless, they are perceived as those who are encouraging others to change their behaviors.

In addition to self-analysis, consultants analyze the system in which they are working, including their own. Although schools have similarities, each is unique with dynamics that are constantly changing. Each has its own culture made up of subcultures based on different academic disciplines, age groups, and backgrounds. Political forces and interpersonal relations also influence the environment of a school. All of these factors blend to determine how the staff will respond to the consultant and what the nature of the working relationship will be.

The loosely-coupled and permeable natures of schools affect their individuality. A loosely organized school implies a lack of coordination between subunits within the school which may result in classroom activities that may not be related to the school's stated goals. By being permeable, a school is susceptible to community influences, a factor which also contributes to its uniqueness.

In total, this means that the work of consultants in each school is different. Knowing in depth the nature of the school system becomes one of the major tasks of the project staff and teacher/consultants, particularly if they happen to be working on improving writing across the curriculum.

The consultant learns about the culture of the school through listening, observing, or interviewing. When engaging in these processes, it is crucial that the consultant remains neutral and non-judgmental, being respectful

of and expressing confidence in the faculty and administration. During this period, the consultant learns things about individuals and systems that might not be learned ordinarily. This information is treated as privileged and confidential and must not become an inadvertent source of gossip.

III. <u>For a writing improvement program to be effective, all significant parties concerned must mutually agree on the nature of the training program to be conducted and the expected results</u>.

As mentioned earlier, the school/KESWP working relationship is usually established when a person from the school system contacts the project staff for help. It is not the project staff that works with the teachers, but it is the teacher/consultants. Since very often teachers have not been consulted to the extent they should have been in establishing the relationship, it then becomes the responsibility of project staff and selected consultants to establish an effective working relationship with the total organization.

Since it is becoming more and more apparent that the one-shot, Saturday morning workshop does not work, systems working with KESWP are encouraged to develop long-range writing improvement efforts that have characteristics of quality staff development to ensure that the programs are such that teachers will continue to improve their skills of writing and the teaching of writing after their work with

KESWP is completed. In this role, project staff and teacher/consultants, in addition to being people capable of improving writing programs, also become staff development counselors. In encouraging school systems to look beyond the one-shot activity, KESWP personnel exercise extreme care lest it appear that the project staff and teacher/consultants are trying to sell something rather than simply trying to serve the customer's and client's needs.

To ensure agreement among all parties about the role of the project, the project staff helps establish some basic understandings. One way that agreement of purpose is accomplished is through interviewing. The project staff asks the customers (superintendent and principals) how the need for their services was established, if prospective participants were involved in the decision, if there are any known sources of resistance, and if they expressed interest in spending their time and reorganizing their lives in order to participate in the proposed training effort. The project staff then asks the same questions of the clients (teachers). Sometimes the teacher/consultants work with project staff in this initial stage of the project. In any case, the consultants are thoroughly informed about the nature of the proposed working relationship.

From the interviews, the project staff and representatives of the school system decide if there is to be a contract. Is there agreement about the purposes of the staff development? Is the system ready for the services? Is

everyone concerned prepared to allocate time and resources for the job? Has the system agreed to the working style of the consultant? If there is sufficient agreement, then the contract is drawn up.

The contract really emerges in two parts--one formal and one psychological. The formal contract covers such things as scope and nature of the work, numbers of visits to the school, kinds of meetings, materials to be purchased, cost of consulting services, required reports, reviews to be made, and evaluation procedures both of the consultant's work and projected outcomes of the effort.

The psychological contract establishes what the real relationship of the inservice will be. Here project staff, teacher/consultants, and system representatives decide such things as strategies on how to deal with conflict, confidentiality of information, and problems and issues that will arise.

Very often, the nature of a contract with KESWP will take the form of five to fifteen training sessions involving the use of five or more writing consultants. The project staff takes the responsibility to ensure that each writing consultant understands very thoroughly the nature of the school system and the training experiences that will have preceded and will follow then with their particular phase of the program. At the completion of each session, the project staff reviews the evaluation forms of that session with the consultants. If it appears that changes are appropriate,

either in nature of the training program itself or in consultants to be used, the changes to be made result from discussions with the project staff, teacher/consultants, the client, and customer. Continued monitoring is essential to ensure that long-range goals of the training program are indeed met. If goal changes are necessary, those changes are completed in such a way that all participants understand the nature of the changes and the rationale for them. Monitoring attendance is particularly important since one of the best indicators of the state of the health of a training effort is attendance. If it is steady, things are proceeding satisfactorily. If it begins to fall, then the entire effort has to be reviewed, redesigned, or cancelled.

IV. Specific working strategies can help the teacher/consultant become more effective.

Although each person behaves as an individual in the consultant role, KESWP has learned that there are several working techniques that contribute importantly to the success of the teacher/consulting role. Those techniques follow:

A. Collegiality

Establishing and maintaining a collegial relationship with participants in the program promotes openness and trust. In this mode, the teachers being trained are treated as colleagues who are invited to help make

decisions and to set goals. Although there may be times when consultants might want to hurry things along and act arbitrarily, they should always avoid this decision.

B. Using Group Problem-Solving Process Skills

Among skills that help promote a collegial working relationship are those of the group problem-solving process. Although most of the work of the writing consultants will be straightforward, there will always be some opportunity for decision making as the group establishes its own priorities and working styles.

Data gathering is the first step of the group problem-solving process. The kind of data used in setting priorities, for example, may be test scores or samples of student writing. The key elements of concern are that the data are accurate and related to the problem at hand. It may be assumed that data have been gathered and analyzed as part of the process that prompted a school system to request the services of KESWP. Experience has proven, however, that sometimes the data that have been gathered are not adequate. Data gathering and analysis, then, are continuing processes throughout the life of the working relationships and therefore are briefly reviewed here.

After the initial data are gathered and seem to be sufficient enough on which to base a decision, the group analyzes and tests it, and, if necessary, gathers more

data. The analysis should enable the group members to isolate the key issues. This is done in an open brainstorming session where as many alternatives as are deemed appropriate are brought out. During this assessment, there is no discussion of or judgment passed on any of the issues. The consultant's role at this juncture is important to help continue to generate alternatives and make sure everyone is respectful of each other's ideas. Effective group problem-solving permits members to offer ideas as individuals without any regard to position in the hierarchy of the school system.

After sufficient alternatives have surfaced, the consultant leads the group into an open discussion session where eventually each issue is placed in priority order. In deciding on priority issues, the group uses the technique of consensus decision making where members discuss each alternative and test the group feeling until there is mutual agreement as to which alternative to select. This may be time consuming, but research indicates that decisions made this way tend to promote ownership. Although not everyone gets the exact solution desired, participants make enough compromises that everyone can live with the final decision. In this decision-making process, the consultant helps the group work with true data and reach solutions rather than dealing with symptoms.

An important factor in group work is for the group to analyze its behavior. After each session, it is time well spent if the group reviews its effectiveness as a decision-making unit.

C. Modelling Teaching Skills

Since the writing consultant is working with another group of teachers, the teacher/consultant has the awesome obligation of being consistently a well-prepared, well-organized, excellent teacher, and this means every session. One way of being a good teacher is to have a wide repertoire of teaching skills which include inquiry, synectics, group problem-solving, simulation, role playing, and other group engaging strategies. Part of the consultant's modelling is the careful handling of teachers who are obviously interested in "putting him or her down" or exposing any weakness in teaching techniques.

D. Dealing with Resistance

Although everyone agrees that volunteer staff development is probably the best, there will be that time when a majority votes for a particular training activity, thereby generating a minority who will resist such an activity. It is important to recognize, as does the classroom teacher, that not everyone is going to appreciate the consultant or feel that the offerings are

worthwhile. The minority's resistance and hostility can be very outspoken, even unpleasant at times. Some effort to engage their involvement and support, and certainly their participation, is necessary. On the other hand, if the minority is determined to be a continuing negative influence, the consultant avoids falling into the trap of adjusting the program to meet their needs at the expense of the rest of the participants.

E. Maintaining Communication Linkages

The project staff takes responsibility for keeping the principal and superintendent involved and informed of the progress of the work, particularly if there are any substantive changes in goals, nature of activities, and a need for additional or different resources. The last thing people well up in the hierarchy of an organization want is to be surprised. If there is a crisis of some nature, the district's leaders would appreciate hearing it from those responsible rather than through the gossip chain.

F. Listening

An indication of any good teacher is the attribute of being a good listener. Therefore, project staff and teacher/consultants work hard at listening and sharing their learning with each other. However, when some move

into the role of a consultant, they seem to feel that in this new station it is no longer necessary to listen for and to observe the reactions of others. General characteristics of KESWP consultants include the capacity to listen, to observe, and to make appropriate changes or alterations in the program based on information so gathered.

G. Social Interactions

If the consulting job lasts for any length of time, there will be many occasions--say breaks, lunches, or dinners--when the consultant and members of the client system will be in a relaxed social setting. KESWP consultants understand they are always working. Clients will ask questions or want clarification of remarks that have been made or details on how to use this or that technique. Whenever possible, when important questions are asked that may have application to the entire system, the consultant defers the answer and suggests that the question be asked when the group reconvenes.

When the consulting relationship endures, it is possible that a few people will manage to occupy the consultant's free time, forming an "in-group," which means there is an "out-group." Signs of such a clique are watched for and the drifting into subgroups avoided.

V. <u>There is a set of known criteria for quality programs of staff development</u>.

If the program to upgrade writing skills is embedded in an overall program of staff development, it is important that the project staff and teacher/consultants have a sense of the scope of the total program. In addition to gaining a background, by working and talking with people at different levels of the organization about staff development, the project staff and teacher/consultants should develop a sense of the bigger picture and demonstrate that they are knowledgeable in staff development.

The fact that KESWP has been brought in to work in an area as important as writing is an indication that the school and system are engaged in an improvement process and are willing to take risks. It is a risk to bring KESWP in. For as competent and qualified as the project staff and teacher/consultants may be, there is always some risk bringing in new people. Consultants should indicate to the customer and client that they recognize the system's commitment to writing improvement and applaud its willingness to accept a certain amount of risk in order to change.

All project staff and teacher/consultants work hard ensuring that their program is high quality. They understand that the more elements of a quality staff development program that are demonstrated to the customer and clients, the greater chance the program has of succeeding. Listed below are key characteristics of staff development programs

that have proven successful in the past and have been identified by KESWP as elements of quality staff development.

A. Planning, implementation, and evaluation by participants

Staff development is by teachers, with teachers, and for teachers, not to teachers. By treating participants in the program as knowledgeable and competent professionals, program planners create an environment that encourages commitment to the program and establishes ownership of the effort. Evidence of being treated as professionals means engaging participants in all phases of the program and certainly involves them in problem-solving activities when the occasion arises. Having participants create evaluation instruments is another way of showing how important they are in the program.

B. Program related to school-site improvement objectives

It is important that each training effort is perceived as a related, continuous, and practical activity. By showing how training objectives conform directly to overall school improvement goals, which is based fundamentally on the needs of youngsters and on what teachers need to satisfy these needs, helps participants see how the program is real and necessary.

C. Support from administration

There are few, if any, programs of high quality that do not have continued support from the administration of the school. Such support includes, but is not limited to, continued funding and released time when requested. Therefore, keeping the administration informed and involved in the effort is crucial.

D. Training related to objectives

Although highly discouraged, if the training is a one-time awareness activity, it should be made known to all involved that changes in classroom behavior should not be an expected outcome. If, however, substantive changes in classroom behaviors are expected, those changes can only be addressed when the program is long-term and includes on-site activities, such as classroom observations followed by coaching and counselling. For such on-site observing and coaching to take place in most schools means at least a change in the normal way of doing business. Planners will have to spend some time talking about observation and follow-up work and designing new organizational arrangements to permit teachers to observe and work with each other.

E. A continuous system of evaluation

Formative (developmental) evaluation planned by the participants starts when the program begins and

continues throughout the program so that changes may be made as necessary. Continuous evaluation is important in order to do such things as adjust the nature of the activities and reallocate resources. Summative (final) evaluation is usually based on prestated goals for the program. Therefore, the early goals should be as realistic as possible, avoiding grandiose promises for dramatic changes. If goals are changed, program managers inform all interested parties of the changes and the reasons.

F. Teacher-to-teacher interaction

A major component in quality staff development programs is the informal interaction between teachers over coffee or in the teachers' room as they discuss teaching and learning. Inservice time should be provided to give teachers a chance to discuss what they have been talking about informally. Such discussion encourages informal interaction between sessions by giving such positive reenforcement for people who do so. When topics discussed informally are introduced and addressed in the more formal setting, participants are encouraged to interact in both situations.

G. Provision for resources

One of the major elements of any good staff development is adequate resources. The contract provides for

resources, but continued attention is necessary to ensure the provision of such things as released time, substitutes, materials, and the usual amenities are arranged and confirmed.

H. Linkage of staff with new ideas

It is important that the planners and trainers are "in tune" with the latest research in the area of writing and plan to build it into the training activities.

I. Capacity building

Program planners should make sure that there is built into the program the capacity for a continuing internal self-renewal effort, including peer observation and coaching.

J. Building on participants' professional capabilities

In building the program, planners realize, as with students, that each participant will bring a different set of needs and capacities to the program. It is necessary, particularly with competent participants, to build on their existing skills rather than present them with redundant experiences.

Through the years there has been much justifiable resistance to staff development because it has been based on the deficiency model of planning. This means that usually one group has decided that another group

has to be "fixed" or remediated in some way. Therefore, because they are deemed deficient, the group will undergo some sort of training that others feel will be good for them. Such remediation naturally generates resistance and hostility, particularly on the part of competent, well-trained teachers. If the training is approached, however, from the aspect that teachers are competent and professional and for this very reason are seeking ways to expand and develop their knowledge, they will be more willing to participate in a training program that will help them become even more effective with students. The training always is conducted on the basic element of mutual respect.

K. Based on carefully analyzed data

Planners make sure that the program is based on valid information, that the need is genuine, and that teachers recognize these factors. When new data and needs emerge as the program develops, they are tested and confirmed with the group and the findings are built into the program.

L. Good mix of content and pedagogy

In any staff development program there is the constant and almost irrelevant discussion centering on the conflict between content and methodology. Content uninterestingly presented has little chance of catching

on, and pedagogy without substance is an empty experience. Therefore, a good mix of content and pedagogy, carefully thought out and well balanced, is necessary for a successful inservice program.

VI. Individuals who have a mastery of consultant skills and knowledge of characteristics of programs of staff development can make a major contribution to the improvement of writing in school systems in which they work.

The blending of the two is necessary. Knowledge of writing and how to teach it without the accompanying consulting skills which enable individuals to work with fellow professionals can only lead to hostility and negative attitudes toward writing and its teaching. Equally disastrous is the skilled, slick consultant who is able to demonstrate all the modern tricks of the staff development trade, but who has no grasp of the subject matter (writing) to be taught. Putting it all together is crucial to successful efforts aimed at upgrading the quality of writing programs in the schools with which KESWP works.